

Event-by-event analysis of heavy ion collisions and thermodynamical fluctuations

E.V. Shuryak ¹

Department of Physics
State University of New York at Stony Brook
Stony Brook, New York 11794

Abstract

The event-by-event analysis of heavy ions collisions is becoming possible with advent of large acceptance detectors: it can provide dynamical information which cannot be obtained from inclusive spectra. We identify some observables which can be related to standard thermodynamical theory of fluctuations and therefore may provide information about properties of hadronic matter at the freeze-out stage. Among those are fluctuations of “apparent temperature” (the p_t slope), as well as the population of different bins of the pion momentum distribution.

¹Email: shuryak@dau.physics.sunysb.edu

1. In the field of heavy ion collisions the event-by-event search for “unusual” events (deviating in some way from the average behavior) is attracting increasing attention. Some future experiments at RHIC (especially STAR and PHOBOS) consider it to be among the central issues of their physics program.

In general, deviations from the average behavior can be of *dynamical* or of *statistical* nature. A well known example of the former kind is strong dependence of all observables on the value of the impact parameter b^2 . Furthermore, *direction* of the impact parameter $\vec{b}$ in the ϕ angle is important for studies of the specific collective effect known as “directed flow”. Non-trivial deviations of dynamical nature due to QCD phase transition were for example predicted in the AGS/SPS energy domain, due to formation of QGP bubbles [1] or of the disoriented chiral condensate (DCC) [2]. In order to see whether those are present or absent in the data, one should have a proper benchmark, the statistical fluctuations we discuss below.

Fluctuations can also be sensitive to non-trivial details of the dynamics. An interesting example was considered by Gazdzicki and Mrowczynski [3]: event-by-event fluctuations of the $\langle p_t \rangle_{event}$ turns out to be sensitive to models describing nuclear collisions. In particular, models considering just a superposition of independent pp events (like e.g. the original VENUS event generator without re-scattering) predict much larger fluctuations compared to models with significant re-scattering of secondaries (e.g. RQMD). This paper has triggered experimental studies, and the preliminary results coming from the NA49 experiment [4] have found that the fluctuations (in the appropriate variable) follow perfect Gaussian³ with small width, clearly excluding any model based on superposition of independent pp collisions.

This impressive example have initiated the present work, which also proposes several observables for which analysis of fluctuations is potentially use-

² Because of its paramount significance most experiments are able to fix its value already at the trigger level, by measuring charge multiplicity, transverse or “spectator” energy.

³ No non-statistical “tails” deviating from it was found, although Gaussian was followed for several orders of magnitude.

ful for uncovering the details of the system's evolution. However, our approach is more general, it is not based on any particular model but rather on well known theory of thermodynamical fluctuations. Although the predicted fluctuations are probably not so spectacular as some dynamical models suggest, they are guaranteed to be there.

2. In general, any statistical fluctuations can be derived from the famous Boltzmann expression relating entropy S and probability P , rewritten by Einstein in the following form

$$P \sim \exp(S) \tag{1}$$

Before we turn to specifics, few general comments about it are appropriate. Applying general thermodynamical theory of fluctuations we rely on statistical independence of fluctuations in different volume elements. The fluctuations of temperature or particle composition should be *independent* on many dynamical details: it is irrelevant whether all elements of the excited system have their freeze-out at the same time or not, whether they freeze-out at rest in the same coordinate frame or are all moving with different velocities⁴ The only thing which matters is *how* the global entropy of the system S depends on the particular observable under consideration.

In general, the fluctuations predicted by (1) neither should be small, nor the discussed system should have macroscopic number of degrees of freedom. The only requirement is that the system is *equilibrated*, in the sense that it equally populates all its available phase space. Applications of theory of thermodynamical fluctuations to multi-hadron production reaction have a long history, going for pp and $\bar{p}p$ reactions back to 70's. In [5] probability of many exclusive channels for low energy $\bar{p}p$ annihilation were calculated: simple textbook formulae for the entropy have predicted quite accurately

⁴ Still it is useful to imagine that the system is cut into many small (but still macroscopic) elements, and if each is taken when it has a given T, μ and put to rest and combined into a common system, the whole system will occupy some total volume V .

their probabilities, starting with channels with only 4 secondaries⁵! In [6] the production of $\bar{K}K$ pairs in a pion gas was considered along these lines further. Summing thermodynamical formulae over states with only proper quantum numbers (no strangeness), a general form of a general dependence of the K/π ratio on the system size (the pion multiplicity N_π) was derived. It changes from $O(N_\pi)$ value for small enough systems to the N_π -independent ratio for large ones, and describes the data perfectly. Very recently similar approach was used in ref.[9], where excellent thermodynamical description of the yields of impressive list of secondaries in e^+e^- , pp and nuclear collisions has been demonstrated⁶.

3. Before discussing statistical fluctuations in details, let us make a general comment about their size. For heavy ion reactions in question the multiplicity is $N = O(10^2 - 10^4)$. Therefore, the total entropy produced is large and the relative statistical fluctuations are small. Obviously they scale as $1/\sqrt{N}$ and are expected to be at few percent level. Sufficient experimental statistics to measure such fluctuations is not a problem.

In a standard way, the mean square deviations of various quantities can be obtained from the expansion of the entropy in powers of the deviation up to second order: thus proper *susceptibilities* appear. So, if measured, the coefficients of $1/\sqrt{N}$ can provide useful information about thermodynamics of hadronic matter.

Our first example is the fluctuations in temperature, which was recently

⁵ Recall that the phase space for 4 particles is already a 8-dimensional integral. Using thermodynamical expressions instead of exact the phase space means saddle point approximation: it has about the same accuracy as Sterling formula for the factorial $N \approx N \log(N/e)$, which is excellent even for not-so-large N .

⁶ We still do not understand why e^+e^- , pp look so equilibrated (see e.g. [10] for recent discussion). Heavy ion collisions is a different matter: they produce larger and longer-lived systems, and also display other features of a macroscopic behavior such as the transverse flow.

discussed in ref.[7]⁷. Standard thermodynamics (see e.g. [8]) tells us that

$$P \sim \exp\left[-\frac{C_v(T)}{2}(\Delta T/T)^2\right] \quad (2)$$

where ΔT is the deviation of temperature from its mean value and $C_v(T)$ is the heat capacity of a hadronic matter. (The heat capacity which enters here is extensive quantity $C_v = T \frac{\partial S}{\partial T}|_{N,V}$, proportional to the total volume V or the number of particles N in the system, so the relative fluctuations depend on N as expected.) So in general, by measuring fluctuations in T we may learn about the heat capacity.

Let us now look at this general idea in more details, discussing which temperature we actually measure and what behavior of the fluctuations we may expect. If the temperature is deduced from slopes of the observed $m_t = \sqrt{p^2 + m^2}$ spectra, it corresponds to the so called *thermal freeze-out* conditions⁸. It happens when the expansion rate of the system becomes comparable to re-scattering rate. Note however, that for different secondaries the re-scattering rate is rather different: say for SPS conditions it is larger for nucleons than for pions, and is even smaller for kaons. Therefore one should see different temperatures, growing from N to π to K . This is indeed what happens if one study realistic cascades (e.g.RQMD).

Recently detailed study of thermal freeze-out have been also made in hydro-based framework [18]. In contrast to naive freeze-out conditions used in most earlier hydro works (freeze-out surfaces approximated by *isotherms* $T = T_f$) proper kinetic condition [13] (see also [14, 15]) was used, separately for π, K, N . It was found that for different secondaries and collisions those surfaces have quite different shapes. In particular, the system cools deeper at its center, and remains hotter at edges: so the relevant final T_f is by no means

⁷ I apologize that I did not know about it while preparing the preprint form of this work: let me thank S. Mrowczynski who informed me.

⁸Not to be confused with those for *chemical freeze-out* ones at which particle composition is determined. The former is related to elastic scattering rates, the latter to inelastic species-changing ones.

a universal constant. Furthermore, they especially depend on the absolute system size: those which are produced with AA collisions with larger A cools to lower T_f . For example, for medium-size nuclei (Si-S) these results suggest $T_f = 140 - 150 \text{ MeV}$, while for central heavy ion collisions (AuAu at AGS and PbPb at SPS) the hadronic re-scattering goes on for long time (about 10-15 fm/c) and typical T_f becomes as low as 100-120 MeV. Additional test of these numbers was provided by a detailed study of the radial collective flow [18] and analysis of HBT radii [20] coming from NA49 experiment.

Let us now return to fluctuations. Experimentally one should better look at some simple observable, e.g. deviations from the mean p_t [3] or a fitted slope of the m_t distribution $\tilde{T}$ in a event. As it is well known, $\tilde{T}$ is not temperature but a combination of freeze-out local temperature T_f and transverse flow velocity v_t of matter elements, averaged over the whole system. It is complicated in practical calculations, but we think the actual situation is significantly simplified because *the fluctuations of v_t are likely to be less important than those of T_f* . This conjecture is motivated as follows: (i) Unlike T_f (which depends on random statistical separation of total energy into transverse momenta, longitudinal momenta and particle masses at the freeze-out moment), v_t is basically an accumulated acceleration during the whole evolution. Random fluctuations in pressure should be significantly washed out after the time integration. (ii) Furthermore, at AGS/SPS energies most of the time the expanding system spends near the QCD phase transition, in the so called mixed phase. As a result, most of the time available the pressure is nearly constant and cannot significantly fluctuate. (iii) The relative role of T_f and v_t in the observed slope significantly depends on the particle mass: v_t is much less important for pions than for nucleons or deuterons. One may compare fluctuations of π, N slopes (the main secondaries) to test our conjecture. (iv) Finally, for pions corrections for transverse motion is basically a “blue shift” factor, which cancels in ratios.

This conjecture implies that

$$\left(\frac{\Delta\tilde{T}}{\tilde{T}}\right)^2 \approx \left(\frac{\Delta T_f}{\tilde{T}_f}\right)^2 = \frac{1}{C_v(T_f)} \quad (3)$$

The key observation at this point is that because $C_v(T)$ has strong T-dependence, it can be used as a “thermometer” to test matter properties at thermal freeze-out.

Particular form of the T-dependence of the heat capacity in the vicinity of the QCD phase transition ($T \sim T_c \approx 150 MeV$) depends on the order of the phase transition⁹. Large peak at $T = T_c$ has been observed in lattice numerical data [12], but its exact form¹⁰ and extrapolation to real QCD is not yet clear. In the hadronic phase $T < T_c$ the thermodynamics is usually described as a “resonance gas” [11]. As shown in [18], the corresponding EOS agrees well with what is used in cascades like RQMD, and also explains the observed flow. For practical purposes its T-dependence can be conveniently parameterized as $\epsilon, p \sim T^{1+1/c^2}$ where parameter c^2 (square of the sound velocity) is (nearly) T-independent. It still depends on matter composition though (baryon charge/entropy ratio), changing from $c^2 \approx .14$ for baryon-rich matter produced at AGS to $c^2 \approx .2$ for baryon-poor one at SPS. Such EOS leads to $C_v \sim T^{1/c^2} \sim T^7$ (T^5) at AGS (SPS), respectively: so even in the hadronic phase the T-dependence of C_v is strong enough to make a good thermometer.

Let us now discuss how it is supposed to work. At qualitative level, a debate continues on whether the observed pions are emitted directly from the QGP clusters/mixed phase (see e.g. [1, 17]) at $T \approx T_c$, or (as we advocated above) they cool further into a resonance gas phase (especially for heavy ions, Pb or Au). In the former case one should find $C_v(T)$ at its peak: the temperature fluctuations should then be strongly suppressed. In the latter scenario, $C_v(T)$ is much smaller, and we end up with a (counter-intuitive!) prediction that fluctuations for heavy ions should be relatively¹¹ *stronger* compared to those for medium ions.

Using the EOS of the resonance gas and numbers for freeze-out tempera-

⁹Delta function for the 1-st order, divergent peak for the second order and a finite peak for a rapid cross-over.

¹⁰It depends on parameters like quark masses used and other methodical details like Wilson versus Kogut-Susskind fermions used.

¹¹Recall that we are discussing a coefficient of $1/\sqrt{N}$.

tures T_f for medium and heavy ion collisions mentioned above ([18]) we can make more quantitative predictions.

$$\frac{[N < (\Delta T_f/T_f)^2 >]^{heavy}}{[N < (\Delta T_f/T_f)^2 >]^{medium}} \sim \frac{C_v(T_f^{medium})}{C_v(T_f^{heavy})} \sim \left[\frac{T_f^{medium}}{T_f^{heavy}}\right]^{1/c^2} \quad (4)$$

Although the values of T_f mentioned above are not that different, this ratio should change by about factor 2, from medium to heavy ions. Such drastic change should be easily observable.

4. Now we proceed to fluctuations of a more detailed observable, the occupation of particular momentum bins in the histograms. In purely statistical system the fluctuations in the particle number are generally described by

$$< \Delta N^2 > = T \frac{\partial N}{\partial \mu} \Big|_{T, \mu} \quad (5)$$

For example, for classical ideal gas we got trivial Poisson statistics. Deviations from it can be induced *without interaction*, just by quantum statistics. For the ideal Bose-Einstein (Fermi-Dirac) gas the expression above leads to enhanced (suppressed) fluctuations:

$$\frac{< \Delta n_k^2 >}{< n_k >} = (1 \pm < n_k >) \quad (6)$$

So, by measuring deviations from Poisson statistics (1 in the r.h.s) one can learn what is the mean quantum degeneracy factor $< n_k >$.

Bose-Einstein (Fermi-Dirac) correlations in two-body distributions of pions (nucleons) originating from heavy ion collisions have been studied for a

long time and is the basis of pion (nucleon) interferometry providing information about space-time picture of the source. Correlation of 3 and more particles should be stronger but present in so small corner of the phase space that those have not been used so far.

Fluctuations in the distributions on event-by-event basis we discuss is just another way to approach the same “induced radiation” phenomenon. The more bosons in a given momentum cell is produced in a given event, the larger is the probability to find another one in the same cell. Like for pion pairs, the interference happens late and the role of interaction should be small.

One of the problems with practical implementation of this simple idea is that the *total* multiplicity of produced pions is known to be a subject of large non-statistical fluctuations, in the first place due to different impact parameters in different events. There may be also other dynamical effects¹². Therefore one should consider deviations from the normalized distributions, or *relative* fluctuations in different bins.

Pions are the only secondaries which are light enough to have noticeable quantum degeneracy n_k at freeze-out stage. For chemically equilibrated pion gas (chemical potential $\mu_\pi = 0$) at zero momentum Bose-enhancement factor $1 + n_k$ is increasing statistical fluctuations (relative to random statistics) by a factor of about 1.5. Naturally, the effect disappears for large momenta.

Furthermore, it was argued that the pion gas is not chemically equilibrated at thermal freeze-out, but has a non-zero chemical potential¹³ μ_π , so

¹²The multiplicity distribution in pp collisions are known to be wide and very non-statistical, and there were even speculations that they display fractal (intermittent) distributions. However, this is not so for nuclear collisions: the only noticeable correlations observed so far in this case are due to Bose-Einstein correlations we discuss, see e.g.[16] .

¹³ The issue has a somewhat controversial history. It first surfaced because of experimentally observed “low p_t enhancement” relative to equilibrium ($\mu_\pi = 0$) distributions. For discussion of pion “over-population” of the phase space see e.g. [19] and references therein: even a “pion laser” conditions ($n_{k=0} \rightarrow \infty$) were discussed. However, in fact most of this enhancement is due to resonance decays.

that the effect should be even stronger. The basic reason for non-zero (μ_π was originally pointed out by G.Baym: adiabatic expansion of the re-scattering pion gas creates it, even if one starts from chemical equilibrium ($\mu_\pi = 0$). Estimates made in [21, 18] has resulted in small effect for medium ions, but for heavy ones (PbPb collisions at SPS) it should reach for mid-rapidities $\mu_\pi \sim 60 MeV$. Moreover, in [18] it is shown that comparison of NA44 data for PbPb and SS shows this effect, with $\mu_\pi \sim 60 MeV$. If so, Bose enhancement of fluctuations at small p_t should be larger, giving the $1 + n_k$ factor of 2.0-2.3. Again this prediction looks counter-intuitive: (relative) fluctuations are enhanced for *larger* (not smaller) systems! Finally, let us point out direct relation between this effect and one of the possible manifestation of DCC. As discussed in [2], the remnants of the disoriented vacuum can be vied as the unusually large population of the low- p_t bins in the pion p_t distribution. If this indeed happens, expression (6) tells us that one should also observe enhanced fluctuations in the corresponding bins induced by Bose-Einstein interference effects.

So far we have discussed an idealized picture of a gas of secondary pions: now we are going to face real situation. First of all, discussion above implied that there exist some common reference frame in which it is at rest, so that the “small momentum” bin discussed above in unambiguous. In reality the pion system consists of volume elements moving with different collective velocities, and this restrict/dilute the Bose enhancement effects. The density leading to enhancement is actually density in the *phase space*: even for pions with identical momenta this effect is absent if their emission points are too far apart in space or too much separated in time. This issue was much debated for two-pion interferometry, with realization that the the so called HBT radii $R_{x,y,z}$ are not the size of the system, but a size of a region in which the velocity change (due to its gradient) can be compensated by thermal velocities. (In other words, those are related to curvatures of the freeze-out surface.) Bose enhancement of fluctuations is as strong as discussed above, provided the bin used has the size such that $|\Delta p_i|R_i < 1$. If for statistics reason the bin is larger, the effect is reduced accordingly.

The second problem is again well understood for two-pion interferometry. Substantial fraction f_{LL} of secondary pions come from long-lived (LL) reso-

nances like ω and weak K_0 decays: those do not interfere with others (unless the resolution or bin size is as small as the inverse lifetime). Two-pion interferometry and the Bose enhancement term we speak about is reduced by it by the same factor $(1 - f_{LL})^2$.

In summary, we have pointed out that statistical fluctuations of the collective observables are related to thermodynamically interesting quantities. In particular, the r.m.s. deviation in the apparent temperature of the events is related to the heat capacity at freeze-out, and fluctuations in the p_t spectrum at small p_t are sensitive to freeze-out temperature and pion chemical potential.

Acknowledgments. This paper was triggered by the talk by G.Roland at Hirscheegg-97. I also thank M.Gazdzicki and S. Mrowczynski for related discussion, and referees of the paper for their thoughtful reading of the original manuscript. This work is partially supported by US DOE.

References

- [1] J. I. Kapusta, A. P. Vischer, Phys.Rev.C52:2725-2732,1995 E.E. Zabrodin, L.P. Csernai, J.I. Kapusta, G. Kluge, Nucl.Phys.A566:407c-410c,1994
- [2] J. Bjorken:Phys.Rev. D27 (1983) 140: A. Anselm, Phys.Lett. B266 (1991) 482: for review see: K. Rajagopal, THE CHIRAL PHASE TRANSITION IN QCD: CRITICAL PHENOMENA AND LONG WAVELENGTH PION OSCILLATIONS. In: Quark-Gluon Plasma 2, edited by R. Hwa, World Scientific, 1995 . hep-ph/9504310
- [3] M. Gazdzicki and S. Mrowczynski; Z. Phys. C54 (1992) 127-132.
- [4] G.Roland, Event-by-event analysis of PbPb collisions, Proceedings the workshop on QCD phase transitions, January 1997, Hirscheegg, Austria.
- [5] E.V. Shuryak, Phys.Lett.42B:357,1972.

- [6] E.V. Shuryak, Sov.J.Nucl.Phys. 20:295,1975.
- [7] L.Stodolsky, Phys.Rev.Lett.75 (1995) 1044.
- [8] Landau, L.D.and E.M. Lifshitz STATISTICAL PHYSICS, (Course of Theoretical Physics, v. 5, 3rd, rev. and enlarged ed.) Pergamon Press, 1980.
- [9] F.Becattini, Talk at “Strangeness and Quark Matter 97”, Santorini,Greece, April 97; hep-ph/9708248.
- [10] F.Becattini and U.Heinz, hep-ph/9702274.
- [11] E.Shuryak, Sov.J. of Nucl. Phys. 16 (1972) 395; R. Venugopalan and M. Prakash, Nucl. Phys. **A546** (1992) 718.
- [12] F. Karsch, B. Beinlich, J. Engels, R. Joswig, E. Laermann, A. Peikert, B. Petersson, Nucl.Phys.Proc.Suppl.53:413-416,1997 e-Print Archive: hep-lat/9608047
- [13] J. Bondorf, S. Garpman and J.Zimanyi, Nucl.Phys.A296,1978,320.
- [14] I.Mishustin and L.Satarov, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. 37 (1983) 532.
- [15] U.Heinz, K.S.Lee and M.J.Rhodes-Brown, Phys.Rev.Lett. 58 (1987) 2292.
- [16] M.Tannenbaum, Talk at Rankontre de Moriond 1997, Phys.Lett.B347:431-438,1995.
- [17] P. Braun-Munzinger and J. Stachel, Nucl.Phys.A606:320-328,1996.
- [18] M.-C.Hung and E.Shuryak, Hydro-Kinetic Model of heavy ion collisions, Stony Brook preprint 1997.
- [19] S. Pratt, Phys.Rev.C49:2722-2728,1994; Phys.Lett.B301:159-164,1993
- [20] U.Heinz, in “QCD phase transitions”, proceedings of workshop at Hirschegg, Austria, Jan.13-18 1997, GSI report.
- [21] H. Bebie,P.Gerber , J.L. Goity, H. Leutwyler. Nucl.Phys.B378:95-130,1992